

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,795	06/30/2003	Ole Simonsen	10279.200-US	1310	
25908 7590 07/06/2007 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC.			EXAMINER		
	500 FIFTH AVENUE			MRUK, BRIAN P	
SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, 1	NV 10110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW TORK,	11 10110		1751	· · ·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/611,795	SIMONSEN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Brian P. Mruk	1751			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWNSIONS OF TIME MAILING DOWNSIONS OF THE MAILING DOWNSIONS OF THE MAILING DOWNSIONS OF THE MAILING DOWNSIONS OF THE MAILING TH	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE.	I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication.			
Status						
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 A</u>	pril 2007:				
		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20,28 and 29</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11,14-20 and 28</u> is/are rejected.					
	7) Claim(s) 12,13 and 29 is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All _b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		d in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bureau	• • •	•			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen		·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Inform						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/611,795

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

- This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed April 20, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 9 and 12. New claims 28 and 29 have been added. Currently, claims 1-20 and 28-29 remain pending in the application.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office action, Paper No. 20061018.
- 3. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and remarks.
- The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the 4. alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Izawa et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,858,952, is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and remarks.
- 5. The rejection of claims 1-11 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820, is maintained for the reasons of record.

Application/Control Number: 10/611.795

Art Unit: 1751

6. The rejection of claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820, is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and remarks.

Page 3

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 1751

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820.

Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820, discloses a coated granular particle containing an active ingredient comprising a core material comprising an enzyme (see abstract, col. 9, lines 18-25, and col. 11, lines 9-col. 12, line 62), 0.1-1% by weight of an antioxidant and/or a reducing agent (see col. 9, lines 52-57). It is further taught by Simonsen et al that suitable reducing agents and antioxidants include sodium thiosulfate (see col. 7, lines 3-18), and that the core also contains polymers, such as polyvinyl pyrrolidone, polyvinyl alcohol, and starch (see col. 6, line 36-col. 7, line 65, and col. 10, lines 1-7), per the requirements of the instant invention. Simonsen et al further discloses that the core is encapsulated by a coating material (see col. 8, lines 9-59), and that the granular particle is made by mixing the ingredients in a spray drying apparatus (see col. 12, line 63-col. 14, line 54). Specifically, note Examples 1-2. Therefore, instant claim 28 is anticipated by Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility. Furthermore, the examiner asserts that "Mere fact that a reference suggests multitude of possible combinations does not in and of itself make any one of those combinations less obvious." *Merck v. Biocraft, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 1989)*.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820, does not teach or suggest in general a core matrix that contains a polymer. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the examiner maintains that Simonsen et al clearly teaches that the core contains a visco-elastic liquid in the core matrix, such as polymers (see col. 9, line 51-col. 10, line 7 of Simonsen et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,070,820), as required in the instant claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 12-13 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

i 13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/611,795

Art Unit: 1751

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P Mruk June 30, 2007

Brian P. Mrwk

Brian P Mruk

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1751